

III. REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1 and 8 have been amended and claims 27-36 have been added. As a result, claims 1, 2, 6-12 and 27-36 remain pending in this application. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2 and 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement and as allegedly being indefinite. Support is found, *inter alia*, in para. 0017 of the original specification. Furthermore, the word “common” has been removed from the claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burger *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0220876), hereafter “Burger,” in view of Deng (U.S. Patent Pub. 2006/0168395), hereafter “Deng.” Claims 6-7 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burger in view of Deng and further in view of McGuffin (U.S. Patent No. 7,010,671 B2), hereafter “McGuffin.” Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Burger in view of Deng and Silberschatz and further in view of Ichikawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,617,560), hereafter “Ichikawa.”

Applicant asserts that the references cited by the Office do not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention as amended. For example, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest storing multiple versions of an application tailored for particular device on a removable storage device with a common datastore and executing the application from the removable storage device to perform operations on the datastore when the removable storage device is coupled with the appropriate device. Neither the wireless “Pocket Vault” of Burger nor the plug-and-play device of Deng discloses this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to independent claim 8, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest storing multiple versions of an application tailored for particular device on a removable storage device with a common datastore and executing the application from the removable storage device to perform operations on the datastore when the removable storage device is coupled with the appropriate device. Neither the wireless “Pocket Vault” of Burger nor the plug-and-play device of Deng discloses this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to newly added independent claim 27 Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest storing multiple versions of an application tailored for particular device on a removable storage device with a common datastore and executing the application from the removable storage device to perform operations on the datastore when the removable storage device is coupled with the appropriate device. Neither the wireless “Pocket

“Vault” of Burger nor the plug-and-play device of Deng discloses this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to newly added independent claim 32 Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest storing multiple versions of an application tailored for particular device on a removable storage device with a common datastore and executing the application from the removable storage device to perform operations on the datastore when the removable storage device is coupled with the appropriate device. Neither the wireless “Pocket Vault” of Burger nor the plug-and-play device of Deng discloses this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejection.

With respect to dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all defendant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office’s interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office’s combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office’s

combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: March 10, 2009

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)